



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

11

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/537,859 03/28/00 PROOST P 49673

HM12/0419
DIKE BRONSTEIN ROBERTS & CUSHMAN
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PRACTICE GROUP
EDWARDS & ANGELL
P.O. BOX 9169
BOSTON MA 02209

EXAMINER

GANSHEROFF, L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED:

04/19/01

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/537,859

Applicant(s)

PROOST ET AL.

Examiner

Lisa Gansheroff

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-4 and 9, drawn to an amino-terminally truncated MCP-2, classified in class 530, subclasses 324 and 351.
- II. Claims 5-8, drawn to DNA molecules, an expression vector, a host cell, and a method comprising culturing the cells, classified in class 536, subclass 23.5 and class 435, subclasses 320.1 and 69.1.
- III. Claims 10 and 11, drawn to the "use of" a protein in the manufacture of a medicament, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
- IV. Claim 12, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The products of inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are the proteins of Group I and the DNA and host cells of Group II. Proteins are biologically, structurally, and functionally different from DNA and host cells. The proteins of Group I are not required to produce the DNA and host cells of Group II, since the DNA, vectors, and host cells of Group II can be made without the use of MCP-2 proteins. The DNA, vectors, and host cells of Group II are not required to produce the proteins of Group I, as proteins can be made synthetically or can be purified from non-recombinant cells

Art Unit: 1636

that naturally make the proteins.

Invention I and the method of Invention II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the proteins of invention can be purified from non-recombinant cells that naturally make the proteins, or it can be synthesized in vitro without the use of host cells comprising vectors.

Inventions I and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the pharmaceutical composition could be patentable based on its pharmaceutical effects. The subcombination has separate utility such as for studying chemokine activity in vitro.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the claims of invention III do not use the DNA, vectors, host cells, or method of Invention II.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product

Art Unit: 1636

as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the proteins of Invention I can be used for in vitro research to study chemokines.

Inventions III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, since the claims of Invention III do not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass, and the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966). Thus, Inventions III and IV are deemed distinct absent evidence otherwise.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, and because the search of each of the Groups would not be coextensive with the searches for the other Groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Peter Corless on 27 March 2000 and 10 April 2000 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election

Art Unit: 1636


being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa J. Gansheroff whose telephone number is (703) 605-1203. The examiner can normally be reached 9 AM - 5 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John LeGuyader can be reached at (703) 308-0447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242 for regular communications. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the patent analyst Dianiece Jacobs whose telephone number is (703) 305-3388 or to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

LG
April 18, 2001



JAMES KETTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER